



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION
DIVISION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL
401 CHURCH STREET
L & C ANNEX 6TH FLOOR
NASHVILLE TN 37243-1534

June 5, 2007

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
RECEIPT #7004 2510 0002 4678 0781

City of Dandridge
Mayor George Gantte
131 East Main Street
P.O. Box 249
Dandridge, Tennessee 37725-0249

Subject: CITY OF DANDRIDGE
DIRECTOR'S ORDER 07-068D
JEFFERSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE

Dear Mayor Gantte:

Enclosed is a Director's Order and Assessment of Civil Penalty issued by Paul E. Davis, Director of the Division of Water Pollution Control, under the delegation of Commissioner James H. Fyke. Read the Order carefully and pay special attention to the NOTICE OF RIGHTS section.

It is the Department's position that corporations, limited partnerships, limited liability companies, and other artificial entities created by law must be represented in any legal proceeding resulting from an appeal of this Order and Assessment by an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Tennessee. Non-attorneys may participate in any such proceedings to the extent allowed by law.

If you or your attorney has questions concerning this correspondence, please contact Jessica Murphy at (615) 532-0676 or you may contact me at (615) 532-0670.

Sincerely,

Vojin Janjic
Manager, Enforcement and Compliance Section

VJ: EJM

cc: WPC-EFO-K-Mike Atchley
WPC-NCO-E&C

**STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION**

IN THE MATTER OF:)	DIVISION OF WATER
)	POLLUTION CONTROL
)	
CITY OF DANDRIDGE)	
)	CASE NO. 07-068D
RESPONDENT)	
)	

DIRECTOR'S ORDER AND ASSESSMENT

NOW COMES Paul E. Davis, director of the Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, and states:

PARTIES

I.

Paul E. Davis is the duly appointed director of the Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control (hereinafter the "division") by the commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (hereinafter the "department").

II.

The City of Dandridge (hereinafter the "Respondent") owns and operates a sewage treatment plant (STP) in Jefferson County, Tennessee. Service of process may be made on the Respondent through the Honorable George Gantte, Mayor, 131 East Main Street P.O. Box 249, Dandridge 37725-0249.

JURISDICTION

III.

Whenever the Commissioner has reason to believe that a violation of Tennessee Code Annotated (T.C.A.) §69-3-101 *et seq.*, the *Water Quality Control Act*, (hereinafter the “Act”) has occurred, or is about to occur, the Commissioner may issue a complaint to the violator and may order corrective action be taken, pursuant to T.C.A. §69-3-109(a) of the Act. Further, the Commissioner has authority to assess civil penalties against any violator of the Act, pursuant to T.C.A. §69-3-115 of the Act; and has authority to assess damages incurred by the state resulting from the violation, pursuant to T.C.A. §69-3-116 of the Act. Department Rules governing general water quality criteria and use classifications for surface waters have been promulgated, pursuant to T.C.A. §69-3-105, and are effective as the *Official Compilation Rules and Regulations of the State of Tennessee*, Chapters 1200-4-3 and 1200-4-4 (hereinafter the “Rule”). Pursuant to T.C.A. §69-3-107(13), the Commissioner may delegate to the Director of the Division of Water Pollution Control any of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Commissioner under the Act.

IV.

The Respondent is a “person” as defined at T.C.A. §69-3-103(20) and as herein described, has violated the Act.

V.

T.C.A. § 69-3-108 requires that a person obtain a permit from the department

prior to discharges into waters of the state. Rule 1200-4-5-.08 states in part that a set of effluent limitations will be required in each permit that will indicate adequate operation or performance of treatment units used, and that appropriately limit those harmful parameters present in the wastewater. Furthermore, it is unlawful for any person to increase the volume or strength of any wastes in excess of the permissive discharges specified under any existing permit.

VI.

Douglas Lake at French Broad River, referred to herein, is “waters of the state”, as defined by T.C.A. §69-3-103(33). Pursuant to T.C.A. 69-3-105(a)(1), all waters of the state have been classified by the Tennessee Water Quality Control Board for suitable uses. Department Rule 1200-4-4, “Use Classifications for Surface Waters,” is contained in the *Official Compilation of Rules and Regulations for the State of Tennessee*. Accordingly, this water body has been classified for the following uses: domestic water supply, industrial water supply, fish and aquatic life, recreation, irrigation, and livestock watering and wildlife.

FACTS

VII.

The division issued to the Respondent National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Number TN0021245 (hereinafter the “Permit”) on August 31, 2005, with an effective date of October 1, 2005, and an expiration date of August 31, 2010. The permit authorizes the Respondent to discharge treated domestic wastewater

from the Dandridge STP located in Jefferson County, Tennessee, to receiving waters named Douglas Lake at the French Broad River mile 45.5 in accordance with effluent limitations, monitoring requirements and other conditions set forth in the permit.

VIII.

On April 16, 2005, division personnel conducted a compliance evaluation inspection (CEI) of the Respondent's STP. During the course of the inspection, division personnel observed poor quality effluent with floating solids leaving the STP. According to the operator, the plant had suffered a near washout of the sludge blankets from excess storm water entering the plant through the collection system. Plant personnel also informed division personnel that the plant and associated collection system would be upgraded in coming year.

IX.

On May 12, 2005, division personnel sent the Respondent a letter detailing the CEI performed on April 16, 2005. The letter noted the poor quality of the effluent observed during the inspection and also mentioned the need to set up *Escherichia coli* testing when the new permit became effective in June of 2005. A list of methods for testing was included in the letter.

X.

During the monitoring period starting March 1, 2006, and ending March 31, 2007, the Respondent reported the following exceedances of permit parameters on the

discharge monitoring reports (DMRs): 10 violations of biochemical oxygen demand, 14 violations of total suspended solids, 11 violations of *Escherichia coli*, 4 violations of settleable solids, 1 violation of chlorine, 1 violation of suspended solids percent removal, 1 violation of biochemical oxygen demand percent removal, 3 bypasses of treatment, and 22 overflows of sewage from the collection system. In addition, the Respondent was deficient in reporting data on the DMRs for 23 parameters required by the permit.

XI.

On April 11, 2007, a complaint was received by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding sewage entering Douglas Lake from the Respondent's STP. The complaint was referred to the division's Environmental Field Office in Knoxville (EFO-K). The complainant also alleged that chemicals were being stored improperly and that anyone could access the facility and chemicals at anytime.

VIOLATIONS

XII.

By discharging wastewater effluent from the WWTP in violation of the terms and conditions of a NPDES permit, the respondent has violated T.C.A. §§69-3-108(b) and 69-3-114(b) which state:

T.C.A. §69-3-108(b):

It is unlawful for any person, other than a person who discharges into a publicly owned treatment works or a person who is a domestic discharger into a privately owned treatment works, to carry out any of the following activities, except in accordance with the conditions of a valid permit:

- (1) The alteration of the physical, chemical, radiological, biological, or bacteriological properties of any waters of the state;

- (3) The increase in volume or strength of any wastes in excess of the permissive discharges specified under any existing permit;
- (6) The discharge of sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes into waters, or a location from which it is likely that the discharged substance will move into waters;

T.C.A. §69-3-114(b)

In addition, it is unlawful for any person to act in a manner or degree which is violative of any provision of this part or of any rule, regulation, or standard of water quality promulgated by the board or of any permits or orders issued pursuant to the provisions of this part; or fail or refuse to file an application for a permit as required in §69-3-108; or to refuse to furnish, or to falsify any records, information, plans, specifications, or other data required by the board or the Commissioner under this part.

XIII.

By discharging from a location other than through a permitted outfall and causing a condition of pollution to the French Broad at Douglas Lake, the Respondent has violated T.C.A. §69-3-108(b) of the Act, as referenced above, and T.C.A. §69-3-114(a) of the Act, which states in part:

It is unlawful for any person to discharge any substance into waters of the state or to place or cause any substance to be placed in any location where such substances either by themselves or in combination with others, cause any of the damages as defined in §69-3-103(22), unless such discharge shall be due to an unavoidable accident or unless such action has been properly authorized. Any such action is declared to be a public nuisance.

ORDER AND ASSESSMENT

XIV.

WHEREFORE, pursuant to the authority vested by T.C.A. §§ 69-3-107, 109, 115–16, I, Paul E. Davis, hereby issue the following ORDER AND ASSESSMENT to the Respondent:

1. The Respondent shall, within ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY DAYS of receipt of this ORDER and ASSESSMENT, submit for approval by the division a corrective action plan/engineering report (CAP/ER) on the system. The CAP/ER shall include, but shall not be limited to, modifications to equipment or operations necessary to comply with all provisions of the subject NPDES permit and a project schedule including timetables for beginning and completing all activities. The Respondent shall submit the CAP/ER in duplicate to the manager of the division's Environmental Field Office in Knoxville (EFO-K) at Suite 220 State Plaza, 2700 Middlebrook Pike, Knoxville, Tennessee 37921, and to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section of Water Pollution Control at 401 Church Street, 6th Floor L&C Annex, Nashville, Tennessee 37243.
2. The Respondent shall, within NINETY DAYS of receipt of the division's written approval, initiate the actions outlined in the CAP/ER, including those items required by the division as comments in the approval of the CAP. At the time of first action on the CAP/ER, the Respondent shall notify the division in writing of the action. This written notification shall be submitted in duplicate to the manager of the EFO-K and to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section of Water Pollution Control at the respective addresses in Item 1.
3. All scheduled activities in the approved CAP/ER shall be complete by March 31, 2010. A notice of completion should be sent to the manager of the EFO-K and to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section at the respective addresses in Item 1.

4. Within NINETY DAYS of receipt of this Order, the Respondent shall submit to the division, a sewer overflow response plan (SORP). The SORP shall include procedures for minimizing health impacts and shall include measures to be taken when overflows discharge on local streets or other public areas. The SORP shall also include appropriate measures for the notification of affected property owners and stream users, and shall include notification of the news media when necessary to protect public health. The SORP shall state specific procedures for notifying known downstream users in the event that untreated wastewater is discharged to waters of the state by sanitary sewer overflow (SSO). These procedures shall include, but not be limited to, provisions for posting warning signs at places where the general public could gain access to polluted waters. Further, posted signs shall remain in place until in-stream monitoring reveals that the water body has returned to normal background conditions. In the event that the division requires the Respondent to modify/revise the SORP, the Respondent shall submit the modified/revised SORP to the division within thirty days of the date of notification. The SORP shall be submitted to the EFO-K and a copy to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section at the respective addresses in Item 1.
5. Within ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DAYS of written approval by the division, the Respondent shall fully implement the SORP. The Respondent shall notify the division, in writing, once the SORP has been fully implemented. The notification shall be submitted to the EFO-K and a copy to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section at the respective addresses in Item 1.

6. Within ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY DAYS of receipt of this Order, the Respondent shall revise or develop, and submit to the division for review and comment, the following Maintenance Operation and Management (MOM) programs as identified in subparagraph 6.vii., below. The revised programs shall be submitted to the EFO-K and a copy to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section at the respective addresses in Item 1. Each individual MOM program will have a sufficient level of documentation to assure the following:
- i. The program is specific to, and tailored for, the utility's infrastructure;
 - ii. The program has a written purpose explaining why the program is needed;
 - iii. The program has specific written goal(s) establishing the accomplishment(s) desired for the current fiscal year;
 - iv. The program has the details of the activities and procedures that are followed to implement the program written down in the form of Standard operating procedures that are used by the utility's personnel;
 - v. The program has established appropriate performance procedures which are tracked by management; and
 - vi. The program has a written procedure requiring periodic review, evaluation, and any necessary revision.
 - vii. The following programs have been identified by the division as significant with respect to Dandridge and are in need of development or revision. Any revisions to existing programs must account for specific concerns, which the division may have identified below. All newly developed programs and revised programs shall meet the narrative criteria identified in 6.i. through 6.vii. above.

- a. Sewerage Assessment Priority Parameters Program
- b. Routine Manhole Inspection Program
- c. Flow Monitoring Program to Support Engineering Studies
- d. Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Program to Support Sewer Assessment
- e. Gravity System Defect Analysis Program
- f. Smoke Testing Program
- g. Gravity Lines Rehabilitation Program
- h. Manhole Rehabilitation Program
- i. Scheduled Pump Stations Operations Program
- j. Emergency Pump Station Operating Program
- k. Grease Control Program
- l. Mechanical Maintenance Program
- m. Capital Improvement Program
- n. Work Order and Complaint Management Program
- o. System Inventory Program
- p. Capacity Assurance Program for New Connections
- q. Long-Term Capacity Assurance Protocols

7. The Respondent shall submit an annual report detailing all updates and changes to any of the individual MOM programs. Each annual report shall be due on March 31st and shall be based upon the activities conducted in the previous calendar year. The first annual report shall be submitted on March 31, 2009, for the 2008 calendar year. The annual reports shall be submitted to the EFO-K and a copy to the manager of the Enforcement and Compliance Section at the respective addresses in Item 1. The last

annual report will be due in the year following completion of all system upgrades.

Each annual report shall also include the following:

- i. A completed system profile and performance summary as outlined in Exhibit A;
 - ii. A completed system-wide MOM programs recent performance summary as outlined in Exhibit B;
 - iii. A completed sub-basin summary statistics summary spreadsheet as outlined in Exhibit C;
 - iv. A five year capital improvement program with projected budgets for each item;
 - v. A narrative description of the status of all contracted wastewater improvement projects, all in house replacement and rehabilitative projects, and the funding status of all improvement projects; and
 - vi. Appropriate maps and any additional documents necessary to fully describe the system status and aid in review.
8. Within 1 year of receipt of this Order, the Respondent shall maintain the capacity, collection, and treatment evaluation protocols for the evaluation of new customer connections. These protocols shall include, but not be limited to, standard design flow rate assumptions (regarding pipe roughness, manhole head losses, “as-built” drawing accuracy [distance and slope], and water use [gallons per capita per day]), and projected flow impact modeling/calculation techniques. The program shall provide for certification of adequate capacity by a registered professional engineer.

The program shall include an information management system for tracking the cumulative studies and relating studies to the infiltration/inflow reduction program.

9. All requirements of this order shall be completed no later than March 31, 2013.
10. The Respondent is hereby assessed a CIVIL PENALTY in the amount of **SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$73,000.00)**, payable as follows:
 - i. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of receipt of this Order and Assessment, pay to the division **FOURTEEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$14,500.00)**
 - ii. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 1, above.
 - iii. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 2, above.
 - iv. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 3, above.
 - v. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 4, above.
 - vi. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 5, above.

vii. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 6, above.

viii. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 7, above.

ix. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 8, above.

x. The Respondent shall, within THIRTY DAYS of default, pay to the division **SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$6,500.00)** if, and only if, the Respondent fails to comply with Item 9, above.

11. Respondent shall otherwise conduct business in accordance with the Act and rules promulgated pursuant to the Act.

The director of the Division of Water Pollution Control may, for good cause shown, extend the compliance dates contained within this Order and Assessment. In order to be eligible for this time extension, the Respondent shall submit a written request to be received a minimum of thirty days in advance of the compliance date. The request must include sufficient detail to justify such an extension and include at a minimum the anticipated length of the delay, the precise cause or causes of the delay, and all preventive measures taken to minimize the delay. Any such extension will be in writing.

Further, the Respondent is advised that the foregoing Order and Assessment is in no way to be construed as a waiver, expressed or implied, of any provision of the law or

regulations. However, compliance with the Order and Assessment will be one factor considered in any decision whether to take enforcement action against the Respondent in the future.

Issued by the director of the Division of Water Pollution Control on this 5th day of

June, 2007.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul E. Davis", written over a horizontal line.

PAUL E. DAVIS, P. E.

Director, Division of Water Pollution Control

NOTICE OF RIGHTS

Tennessee Code Annotated §§ 69-3-109, 115, allow any Respondent named herein to secure review of this Order and Assessment. In order to secure review of this Order and Assessment, the Respondent must file with the director at the address below a written petition setting forth each of the Respondent's contentions and requesting a hearing before the Water Quality Control Board. The Respondent must file the written petition within thirty (30) days of receiving this Order and Assessment.

If the required written petition is not filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this Order and Assessment, the Order and Assessment shall become final and will be considered as an agreement to entry of a judgment by consent. Consequently, the Order and Assessment will not be subject to review pursuant to T.C.A. §§ 69-3-109, 115.

Any hearing of this case before the Water Quality Control Board for which a Respondent properly petitions is a contested case hearing governed by T.C.A. § 4-5-301 et seq of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act, and the Department of State's Uniform Rules of Procedure for Hearing Contested Cases Before State Administrative Agencies. The hearing is in the nature of a trial before the Board sitting with an Administrative Law Judge. The Respondent may subpoena witnesses on its behalf to testify.

If the Respondent is an individual, the Respondent may either obtain legal counsel representation in this matter, both in filing its written petition and in presenting evidence at the hearing, or proceed without an attorney. Low-income individuals may be eligible

for representation at no cost or reduced cost through a local bar association or legal aid organization.

Payment of the civil penalty shall be made to “Treasurer, State of Tennessee” and shall be sent to Enforcement and Compliance Section, Division of Water Pollution Control, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 6th Floor L & C Annex, 401 Church Street, Nashville, TN 37243-1534. All other correspondence shall be sent to Paul E. Davis, Director, Division of Water Pollution Control, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 6th Floor L & C Annex, 401 Church Street, Nashville, TN 37243-1534. Include case number (07-068D) on all payments and correspondence

Exhibit A

SYSTEM PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Population Served: _____

Number of Customers: _____

Number of Treatment Plants: _____

Total Wastewater Design Treatment Capacity: _____

Total Volume of Wastewater Treated: _____

Miles of Gravity Sewers: _____

Number of Manholes: _____

Number of Inverted Siphons: _____

Number of Pump Stations: _____

Miles of Force Main: _____

Number of Employees: _____

Annual Capital Improvement Budget: _____

Annual Operation and Maintenance Budget: ... _____

Total Annual Operating Budget: _____

Exhibit B

System-Wide MOM Programs Recent Performance Summary													
Performance Measures for Previous 12 Months		Year	Month										
A. Number of Customer Complaints													
B. Number of NPDES Permit Violations													
C. Number of Capacity-Related Overflows													
D. Number of Maintenance-Related Overflows													
E. Number of Operations-Related Overflows													
F. Number of Blockages													
G. Number of Cave-Ins													
H. Number of Pump Station Failures													
I. Peak Flow Factor at Treatment Plant (1 hour high/dry month avg.)													
J. Monthly Average Treatment Plant Flow Rate (gal/capita/day)													
K. Monthly High One Day Treatment Flow Rate (gal/capita/day)													
L. Number of By-Passes at Treatment Plant													
M. Volume of Treatment Plant By-Passes (gal)													
N. WWTP Weekly Average Influent BOD (mg/L)													

Exhibit C

I.

Basin Name/Number

Data shall be entered basin by basin unless otherwise noted

Gravity Lines per
Basin(feet)
Force main per
Basin(feet)
Connections per
basin

Overflows

Overflows per
Basin
Estimated
Gallons of
Overflows Total per
Basin
Overflows
Reaching Waters
Estimated
Gallons of
Overflows
Reaching Waters
Overflows at
Treatment Plant
Dry Weather
Overflows per
Basin
Wet Weather
Overflow Events
per NPDES Permit
Language
Wet Weather
Overflow Individual

Releases

Overflows

Cleaned Up

Overflows

Reported via paper
or electronic DMR

Overflows Initial
Report Notification
to TDEC

Overflows Follow-
up Report Sent to
TDEC within 5
Days

Building Backups
Due to Public
System Failure
during Dry Weather

Building Backups
Due to Public
System Failure
during Wet
Weather

Complaints

Complaints
Received

Complaints
Investigated

Complaints
Resolved

Complaints
determined to be
Customer Private
Line Issues

Assessment and Prioritization

Corrosion

Locations Subject
to Corrosion

Corrosion
Inspections

Conducted

Corrosion Defects
Identified

Manholes

Manholes per
Basin

Manholes
Inspected during
the Calendar Year

Manholes
Inspected since
Program Began

Manholes with
Defects

Flow

Measurement

Year of Most
Recent Flow

Monitoring

Peak Flow

Observed During

Monitoring

Period(gpd)

Instantaneous

Peak Flow

Observed(gpm/cfm)

Average Flow

Observed during

Monitoring

Period(gpd)

Low Flow Observed

during Monitoring

Period(gpd)

List Basins that

Contribute Flow to

this Basin

CCTV Inspection

Feet Inspected by
CCTV this
Calendar Year

Feet Inspected
since Program
Began
Feet Cleaned for
Inspection
Feet Cleaned for
Routine or
Scheduled
Maintenance
Defects Identified
by CCTV
Inspection
Defects
Catalogued or
Recorded into
Database

Smoke Testing

Feet Smoke
Tested this Year
Leaks Identified
on Public System
Public System
Leaks Repaired
Public System
Leaks Not
Repaired This Year
Public Leaks Not
Repaired Since
Program Began
Leaks Identified
on Private Service
Connections
Private Service
Leaks Repaired
Private Leaks
Identified but Not
Repaired This Year
Private Leaks Not
Repaired Since
Program Began

Gravity Line

Rehabilitation

Feet Gravity
Lines Rehabilitated
Feet
Rehabilitated Since
Program Began
Feet Replaced
Feet Replaced
Since Program
Began
Feet Sliplined
Feet Sliplined
Since Program
Began
Feet Cured in
Place
Feet Cured in
Place Since
Program Began
Manholes
Rehabilitated
Manholes
Rehabilitated Since
Program Began
Manholes
Replaced
Manholes
Replaced Since
Program Began
Feet of Gravity
Line Rehabilitation
Inspected
Feet Of Gravity
Line Rehabilitation
Tested

Grease Program

Facilities
Required to have a
Grease Device
Facilities with
Installed Grease
Devices

Grease
Installation
Inspections
Conducted and
Documented
Routine Grease
Inspections
Facilities
Inspected for
Compliance with
Grease Ordinance
Grease NOV's to
System Users
Fines issued to
Grease Generators
Grease
Generators Water
Service
Discontinued

Other Inspections

Construction
Inspections
Pumps Station
Inspections
Documented
Pump Station
Inspections